From: Benjamin Shorr

To: <u>Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA</u>

Cc: Robert W. Gensemer; Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Carrie A. Smith; David DeForest; Joe

Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject: Re: Revised draft eco-PRG table

**Date:** 04/13/2009 10:24 AM

Eric et al-

The integrated benthic risk overlays do incorporate the empirical bioassay data- with bioassay data "trumping" predictive models in cell representation. These layers and the empirical bioassay results can be overlaid and integrated into remedial scenario/areas evaluations.

Carrie has a copy of the most recent (Nov 2008) analysis.

Ren

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> We should use PECs for the metals. I do not know what to use for BEHP.

> Note that we will be developing site specific numbers for benthic risk

> based on application of the predictive models. We also have some

> benthic risk layers that Ben Shorr developed that we can apply as an

> over lay to the PEC numbers. The goal is to anticipate, as best we can,

> areas that will likely pose a risk to the benthic community. I am not

> sure at this time, how we can best map the empirical bioassay results.

Eric

"Robert W. Gensemer" <rgensemer@param etrix.com>

etrix.com> Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA 04/13/2009 07:29 Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,

AM "Carrie Ā. Smith"

<CSmith@parametrix.com>, David

DeForest

> Eric: Yes, this does make sense. Upon giving this a fresh look, I agree > that we probably have too many pesticides on here--many were not on our > original list of "driver"chemicals; perhaps they carried over from our > earlier HH version of the table. Lets look into that, David.

> I'm fine with adding a few key metals, but all we'd have is off the > shelf PEC-type numbers, or DEQ screening numbers for the time being. > Same with phthalates, which should be on here somehow. > -Bob

----Original Message---From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Saturday, April 11, 2009 9:25 AM
To: Robert W. Gensemer
Cc: Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Carrie A. Smith; David DeForest;
Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: Revised draft eco-PRG table

> Maybe I did not look this over as thoroughly as I could've but it seems > we should add additional metals - cadmium, chromium, copper, nickel and > zinc - we have known sources of these chemicals in the harbor (e.g., > Arkema, stormwater). In addition, the list of pesticides is much larger > than the original list that Burt developed. This is not necessarily a > bad thing but it is likely that for most of these pesticides, HH PRGs > will drive cleanup. I think it is useful to look at key PBTs (i.e., > detected at a relatively high frequency at the site) for both human > health and ecological risk. I am not sure if the we need to look at all > the pesticides on this list.

Another chemical or chemical class that is not on the list is BEHP or phthalates in general. I understand that the LWG has not been able to develop a relationship between sediments and tissue for phthalates. It would be great if we can figure out how to assess phthalates - maybe a marine PEL. I don't know the best way to handle this.

> Does any of this make sense?

Eric

"Robert W. Gensemer' <rgensemer@param Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA etrix.com> 04/10/2009 04:37 Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, PM "Carrie Ā. Smith' <CSmith@parametrix.com>, David DeForest <deforest@parametrix.com>, Joe
Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA Subject RE: Revised draft eco-PRG table > Eric: Perhaps I'm misunderstanding your comment, but I think we did take > out the HHRA PRGs in this latest version of the table. Also, we did add > in the few EPA "risk driver" chemicals that LWG did not develop PRGs > for Therefore, what chemicals are missing from this list? --Original Message--> From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov > [mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov] > Sent: Friday, April 10, 2009 2:41 PM > To: Robert W. Gensemer > Cc: Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Carrie A. Smith; David DeForest; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov Subject: Re: Revised draft eco-PRG table Bob, this table seems to focus on the PRGs that the LWG identified in their early PRG document. I think we need to take a different look at this to identify PRGs for additional chemicals not on this list (e.g., PECs or other SQGs protective of the benthic community). Further, I amont sure we need to map eco PRGs for the entire list of HHRA PRGs. Eric "Robert W. Gensemer <rgensemer@param Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA etrix.com> Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, 04/10/2009 02:17 Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, David DeForest <deforest@parametrix.com>,
"Carrie A. Smith" <CSmith@parametrix.com> Subject Revised draft eco-PRG table > Burt and Eric: Attached is our latest version of the eco-PRG summary > table that David has been pulling together for us. We added in the > background values from the LWG report and made a few other tweaks from a > discussion Burt, David, and I held this morning. So this should > represent most or all of the "easily" available PRGs we can use from > which to select priority values for the GIS work. Hopefully the eco team > will be able to convene on monday to make those selections or make any > other needed adjustments. > Burt: feel free to distribute this latest "v3" version to the eco team > as you see fit. Should be ready to go now. We may need to explain a few > choices on the phone next week, but that's no big deal. > Let me know if you need anything else on this today, and have a great > weekend, -Bob > inspired people - inspired solutions - making a difference Robert W. Gensemer, Ph.D.
Senior Toxicologist, Division Manager
phone: 541.791.1667, x-6510
fax: 541.791.1699
cell: 541.760.1511

> rgensemer@parametrix.com
> [attachment "Early PRG Summary Table v3.xls" deleted by Eric
> Blischke/R10/USEPA/US]

Benjamin Shorr | Physical Scientist NOAA National Ocean Service Office of Response & Restoration Assessment & Restoration Division 7600 Sand Point Way NE Seattle, WA 98115

benjamin.shorr@noaa.gov (v) 206.526.4654 (f) 206.526.6865 http://response.restoration.noaa.gov/orr\_about.php